

Comparative studies of the relationship between specificity and scrambling and the effect on the scope of the object in Persian and Japanese

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 著者 | Mohebbi Farzane, Koizumi Masatoshi |
| journal or publication title | 言語科学論集 |
| volume | 13 |
| page range | 15-29 |
| year | 2009-12-01 |
| URL | http://hdl.handle.net/10097/48316 |

Comparative Studies of the Relationship between Specificity and Scrambling and the Effect on the Scope of the Object in Persian and Japanese

Farzane MOHEBBI

Masatoshi Koizumi

Keywords: Scrambling, Specificity, Scope, Japanese, Persian

Abstract

In the present study, I analyzed the effect of scrambling on the scope of object with respect to the specificity in Persian. According to Hayashishita (1999, 2000) scrambled element can take wide scope and induce distributive reading irrespective to the NP type. It means that the scrambled non-specific NP can also take distributive reading like the specific one. In contrast, Karimi (2003) argues that in Persian the non-specific direct object cannot show wide scope over another quantified element even when it is scrambled. In this study I show that with using non-specific NP or indefinite-specific NP, not the universally quantified NP, the non-specific direct object can take wide scope and distributive reading if scrambled over indirect object.

1. Introduction

This study aims to examine the effect of scrambling on the scope of objects with respect to their specificity in Persian vis--vis that in Japanese. According to Karimi (2003), the nonspecific direct object in Persian cannot take wide scope over other quantified elements even if it is scrambled. In contrast, Hayashishita (1999, 2000) demonstrates that in Japanese, scrambled elements can take wide scope and can also induce distributive reading (henceforth DR) irrespective of its specificity; the scrambled non specific NPs (noun phrase) can display wide scope and induce distributive reading like specific counterparts. He shows that the subject too takes wide scope despite its specificity, and the same holds for the indirect object. He also argues that the direct object can take wide scope over the indirect object, if the direct object is a specific quantified NP. In this paper, on the basis of Japanese data, I will examine the change of scope of subject and objects in Persian with scrambling and discuss whether scrambling changes the scope of a nonspecific direct object. I will show that in some cases, the scrambled nonspecific direct

object can take wide scope and induce distributive reading if it interacts with other quantified NPs located in the position of the indirect object.

In section two, we will observe the interaction of scrambling and specificity as well as the change of scope in Japanese. Section three will discuss scope ambiguity in Persian.

2. Scope Ambiguity in Japanese

Hayashishita (1999, 2000) divides QPs into two types. Those in Type A are the ones that can refer to a specific group, and those in Type B are those that cannot refer to a specific group. In other words, the former contains specific NPs and the latter includes nonspecific NPs. From the following examples, you can observe the two types of QPs according to Hayashishita (1999, 2000).

- (1) Type A: QPs that can “refer” to a specific group.

Toyota to Nissan “Toyota and Nissan,” dareka “someone”
subete-no kaisyā “all companies,” sannin-no otoko “three men”

- Type B: QPs that cannot “refer” to a specific group.

sanninizyoo-no gakusee “three or more students,”
40% izyoo no gakusee “40% or more of the students,”
sukunakutomo sannin-no gakusee “at least three students,”
kanarinokazu-no gakusee “a good number of students”

According to Hayashishita (1999, 2000), QPs of Type B are similar to Liu’s (1990) nonspecific NPs. Liu argues that with respect to their semantic scope vis--vis other NPs, NPs can be divided into four different types. We review Liu’s four types of NPs in the following. The first type, Type A, pertains to NPs such as individual names, that is, proper nouns. Their scope does not depend on other NPs, but they induce scope-dependency for other NPs. The second type, Type B, is specific NPs such as universally quantified NPs. These NPs induce scope-dependency for other NPs, but their scope does not depend on them. The third type of NPs, referred to as Type C, include NPs modified with a bare numeral; they induce scope-dependency for other NPs, and their scope also depends on other NPs. Liu collectively refers to these three types of NP as “generalized-specific NPs.” The fourth type of NPs, Type D NPs, are those that are qualified by a modified numeral, such as “more than,” “at least,” and “exactly” (and so on). They are nonspecific NPs, which do not induce scope-dependency for other NPs, but their scope depends on other NPs. As mentioned above, Hayashishita’s Type B NPs are nonspecific NPs and are similar to Liu’s Type D NPs.

Here, we will review the scope interaction of quantified NPs with respect to their specificity in Japanese from Hayashishita’s (1999, 2000) point of view.

According to him, the subject in the basic word order irrespective of the NP type can take scope over the object and induce distributive reading. For example, the subject NP in (2) is specific, while its counterpart in (3) is nonspecific. However, in both cases, the subject takes wide scope and induces distributive reading over the object, as shown in the examples given below. Needless to say, all the Japanese examples used in this section are from Hayashishita's work. In following examples, DR<NP1, NP2> signifies the DR for NP1 over NP2.

- (2) Sannin-no otoko-ga hitori-no onna-o paatii-ni sasotta.

"Three men invited one woman to the party."

^{YES}DR<subject NP, non-subject NP>

- (3) Sanninizyoo-no otoko-ga hitori-no onna-o paatii-ni sasotta.

"Three or more men invited one woman to the party."

^{YES}DR<subject NP, non-subject NP>

In the basic word order, the distributive reading of the object over the subject is limited; if the object is an NP of type B. Example (4a) given below is predicted to be ambiguous while the object is specific, and therefore, although a wide-scope reading for the subject is still possible, the object can take scope over the subject and induce distributive reading. In contrast, the object in (4b) is nonspecific and a wide-scope reading is not possible.¹

- (4) a. (watasi-ga mitatokorodewa), [_{NPnom} (sukunakutomo) ippon-no ya]-ga [_{NPcm} itutu-no mato]-ni sasatta.

"(what I observed was), [_{NPnom} (at least) one arrow] pierced [_{NPcm} five targets]."

^{YES}DR<NPcm, NPnom>

- b. (watasi-ga kiitatokorodewa), [_{NPnom} (sukunakutomo) ippon-no ya]-ga [_{NPcm} 15.5% izyoo-no mato]-ni sasatta (rasii yo).

"(from what I heard), [_{NPnom} (at least) one arrow] pierced [_{NPcm} 15.5% or more of the targets]."

^{NO}DR<NPcm, NPnom>

Hayashishita argues that distributive reading of objects over subject (DR<NPcm, NPnom>) in the "scrambled" order is available despite the specificity. The relevant examples are illustrated below. In (5a) and (5b), the indirect objects are scrambled over the subject. In (5b), the scrambled nonspecific object can take wide scope over the subject and induce distributive reading like its specific counterpart.

¹ nom stands for nominative, and cm accusative or dative. NPnom signifies a subject NP, and NPcm a non-subject NP.

- (5) a. (watasi-ga mitatokorodewa), [_{NPcm} itutu-no mato]-ni [_{NPnom} (sukunakutomo) ippon-no ya]-ga sasatta.
 “(Lit.) (what I observed was), [_{NPcm} five targets], [_{NPnom} (at least) one arrow] pierced.”
^{YES}DR < NPcm, NPnom >
- b. (watasi-ga kiitatokorodewa), [_{NPcm} 15.5% izyoo-no mato]-ni [_{NPnom} (sukunakutomo) ippon-no ya]-ga sasatta (rasii yo).
 “(Lit.) (from what I heard), [_{NPcm} 15.5% or more of the targets], [_{NPnom} (at least) one arrow] pierced.”
^{YES}DR < NPcm, NPnom >

In the below example scrambled non specific direct object take wide scope over the subject and show distributive reading.

- (6) 20.5% izyoo-no kouriten-o hutatuizyoo-no ginkoo-ga siensita-ra...
 (Lit.) If 20.5% or more of the retail shops, two or more banks supported, ...
^{YES}20.5% -MORE > 2-MORE

Hayashishita (2000) argues that the same situation is observed in a ditransitive construction. In the basic word order, the indirect object takes wide scope over the direct object irrespective of the specificity; further, the wide-scope reading of the direct object over the indirect one is available if the direct object is a specific NP. However, in the scrambled order, the direct object can take wide scope over the indirect object regardless of the specificity. As shown in (7a), the indirect object can induce distributive reading over the direct object. In this case, the direct object can take wide scope over the indirect object and show distributive reading because it is specific. In contrast, the direct object in (7b) is nonspecific, and cannot illustrate wide scope over the indirect object.

- (7) a. Kimura sensee-ga hutatuizyoo-no kaisya-ni sannin-no gakusee-o syookaisita-ra
 “If Prof. Kimura introduced to two or more companies three students...”
^{YES} 2-More > 3
^{YES} 3 > 2-More
- b. Kimura sensee-ga hutatuizyoo-no kaisya-ni 10 % izyoo-no gakusee-o syookaisita-ra ...
 “If Prof. Kimura introduced to two or more companies 10% or more of the students, ...”
^{YES} 2-MORE > 10% -MORE
^{NO} 10% -MORE > 2-MORE

In (8), the specific direct object moves over the indirect object and takes wide

scope. Similarly, the scrambled nonspecific object in (9) also can take wide scope over the indirect object and trigger distributive reading.

- (8) Kimura sensee-ga sannin-no gakusee-o 10% izyoo-no kaisya-ni syookaisita-ra
 “If Prof. Kimura introduced three students to 10% or more of the companies, ...”
 YES 3 > 10% -MORE
 YES 10% -MORE > 3

- (9) Kimura sense-ga 10% izyoo-no gakusee-o hutatuizyoo-no kaisya-ni syookaisita-ra
 ...
 “If Prof. Kimura introduced 10 % or more of the students to two or more companies, ...”
 YES 2-MORE > 10% -MORE
 YES 10% -MORE > 2-MORE

In this section we observed two types of NPs, specific and nonspecific NPs, and demonstrated how according to Hayashishita, scrambled objects can take wide scope over other NPs irrespective of their specificity. In the next section, I focus on the scrambled objects in Persian and examine the relation between their change of scope and specificity.

3. Scope Ambiguity in Persian

Karimi (2003) argues that specific objects enter scope interaction when scrambled, whereas nonspecific objects do not. The following are the examples that are used as evidences by Karimi to prove her argument. The direct object in (10) is a specific NP, which is followed by the particle -ra. The direct object in (11) is a nonspecific NP and does not take the particle -ra. In Persian, only the specific direct object is followed by the article -ra, but the nonspecific counterpart is not. In these two examples, neither the specific object nor the nonspecific object takes scope over the subject. Note that in this case, the subject is a universally quantified NP.

- (10) har daneshju-i ye she' r-ro bayad be -xun-e har >> DP+ra
 every student-ind one poem-ra must subj-read-3sg
 “Every student has to read one poem (out of a specific set).”

- (11) har daneshju-i ye she' r bayad be -xun-e har >> DP
 every student-ind one poem must subj-read-3sg
 “Every student has to read one poem.”

According to Karimi (2003), although a narrow-scope reading is still possible, the

scrambled specific object given in (12) can take scope over the subject and induce a new reading. In contrast, the scrambled nonspecific object in (13) cannot do so.

- (12) ye she' r-ro har daneshju-i t_i bayad be-xun-e DP+ra>>har(every)
one poem-ra every student-ind must subj-read-3sg har(every)>>DP+ra
Primary reading: "There is one poem that every student must read."

- (13) ye she' r har daneshju-i t_i bayad be-xun-e har(every)>>DP
one poem every student-ind must subj-read-3sg

It was pointed out in the previous section that according to Liu (1990), NPs interact with universally quantified NP cannot take wide scope. In the example taken up by Karimi in (10-13), the subject is a universally quantified NP that does not allow distributive reading for other NPs that interact with it; then, the scrambled nonspecific NP in this example cannot take wide scope over the universally quantified NP. The question here concerns whether a change of scope occurs for the object if the NP in the subject position is not universally quantified.

In this section, I used NPs that are qualified by modified numerals, such as "more than two," as nonspecific NPs, and those qualified by bare numerals, such as two, as specific NPs. Examples of the two types of NPs used in this paper are illustrated below.

- (14) Type A: specific NP

Toyota va Nissan "Toyota and Nissan,"
har daneshju "every student," 3 ta daneshju "three students"

- Type B: nonspecific NP

bishaz 3 daneshju "three or more students,"
hadeaghal 3 daneshju "at least three students,"

First, let us examine scope interaction between the subject and indirect object in the transitive construction for the basic word order. In (15), the subject is a specific NP, while the subject in (16) is a nonspecific NP. In both cases, the subject takes wide scope over the object. On the other hand, the objects in (15) and (16) are nonspecific NPs, and they cannot take wide scope over the subject.²

- (15) (ta anja ke man didam), l tir be bishaz -5 hadaf xord
as far as I saw 1 arrow to more than 5 target pierced
"(what I observed was) 1 arrow pierced more than five targets."

² NOM stands for nominative QP, DAT a dative QP, and ACC an accusative QP.

NOM > DAT 1 > bishaz5
 *DAT > NOM *bishaz-5 > 1

- (16) (ta anja ke man shenidam), hadeaghal 1 tir be bishaz 5 hadaf xord
 as far as I heard at least 1 arrow to more than 5 target pierced
 "(From what I heard) at least one arrow pierced more than five targets."
 NOM > DAT 1 > bishaz-5
 *DAT > NOM *bishaz -5 > 1

The same situation is seen for the subjects in (17) and (18). The specific subject in (17) and the nonspecific subject in (18) induce wide scope over objects. The objects in both (17) and (18) are specific. The specific objects in these examples can take wide scope and induce distributive reading over subjects. Thus we can presume that, similar to Japanese, the specific indirect object in Persian can take wide scope and induce distributive reading over the subject in the basic word order.

- (17) (ta anja ke man didam), 1 tir be -5 hadaf xord
 as far as I saw one arrow to five target pierced
 "(what I observed was) one arrow pierced five targets."
 NOM > DAT 1 > 5
 DAT > NOM 5 > 1
- (18) (ta anja ke man shendam), hadeaghal 1 tir be 5 hadaf xord
 as far as I heard at least 1 arrow to 5 target pierced
 "(From what I heard) 1 arrow pierced more than five targets."
 NOM > DAT hadeshgha 1 > 5
 DAT > NOM 5 > hadeaghal 1

Now let us see the scope interaction between the subject and direct object with respect to specificity. In (19) and (20), the direct object is nonspecific and does not take wide scope over the subject, whereas the specific subject in (19) and the nonspecific subject in (20) take wide scope over the objects and induce distributive reading, as is the case in Japanese.

- (19) agar 15 -(ta) bank bishaz 3-(ta) madrese ta'mir-kon-and...
 if 15 bank more than 3 school repair-do-3pl...
 "If fifteen banks repair three or more schools,..."
 NOM > ACC 15-(ta) bank > bishaz 3-(ta) madrese
 *ACC > NOM *bishaz 3-(ta) madrese > 15-(ta) bank

- (20) agar bishaz 15 -(ta) bank bishaz 3-(ta) madrese ta'mir-kon-and...
if more than 15 bank more than 3 school repair-do-3pl...
"If fifteen or more banks repair three or more schools..."
NOM > ACC pishaz 15-(ta) bank > bishaz 3-(ta) madrese
*ACC > NOM *bishaz 3-(ta) madrese > bishaz 15-(ta) bank

In (21) and (22), the direct object is specific. In these cases, the direct object can take wide scope and induce distributive reading over the subject; although, in both examples wide scope for subject is possible, too.

- (21) agar 15 -(ta) bank 3-(ta) madresa-ro ta'mir-kon-and...
if 15 bank 3 school -ra repair-do-3pl...
"If (the) fifteen banks repair (the) three schools..."
NOM > ACC 15-(ta) bank > 3-(ta) madrese
ACC > NOM 3-(ta) madrese > 15-(ta) bank

- (22) a. agar bish-az 2 bank 5-(ta) madrese-ra ta'mir-kon-and...
if more than 2 bank 5 school -ra repair-do-3pl...
"If two or more banks repair (the) five schools..."
NOM > ACC bish-az 2 bank > 5-ta madrese-ra
ACC > NOM 5-ta madrese-ra > bish-az 2 bank

The above examples demonstrate that in Persian, the subject can always take a wide scope over the object in the basic order irrespective of specificity, whereas the wide scope of objects over the subject in the basic word order is possible only when the objects are specific NPs.

As we saw in section two, according to Hayashishita (1999), in Japanese scrambled objects over subjects can take wide scope and induce distributive reading irrespective of their specificity. In the following, we illustrate scope ambiguity with respect to scrambling and specificity in Persian.

In (23) and (24), the nonspecific indirect object is scrambled over the subject. As a result of scrambling, the nonspecific direct object can take (receives) wide scope and induce distributive reading over the subject. Then, the ambiguity in (23) and (24) wide-scope reading is possible for both the subject and indirect object.

- (23) (ta anja ke man shenidam), [be bishaz -5 hadaf]_i 1 tir t_i xord
as far as I heard to more than 5 target 1 arrow pierced
"(from what I heard) one arrow pierced more than five targets."
NOM > DAT 1 > bishaz 5
DAT > NOM bishaz-5 > 1

- (24) (ta anja ke man shenidam), [be bishaz 5 hadaf]_i hadeaghal 1 tir t_i xord
 as far as I heard to more than 5 target at least 1 arrow pierced
 "(from what I heard) at least one arrow pierced more than five targets."
 DAT > NOM bishaz -5 > 1
 NOM > DAT 1 > bishaz-5

Similarly, in (25) and (26), scrambled indirect objects are specific NPs. In these examples, a wide-scope reading is also possible for scrambled direct objects.

- (25) (ta anja ke man shenidam), [be 5-ta -az hadaf-ha]_i 1 tir t_i xord
 as far as I heard to 5- of target-pl 1 arrow pierced
 "(from what I heard) one arrow pierced more than five targets."
 NOM > DAT 1 > 5
 DAT > NOM 5 > 1

- (26) (taanja ke man shendam), [be 5-ta -az hadaf-ha]_i hadeaghal 1 tir t_i xord
 as far as I heard to 5 of target -pl at least 1 arrow pierced
 "(from what I heard) at least one arrow pierced more than five targets."
 DAT > NOM 5 > hadeaghal 1
 NOM > DAT hadeshgha 1 > 5

The nonspecific direct objects in (27) and (28) are scrambled over the subject. The scrambled nonspecific object in (27) cannot take wide scope over the subject, and hence cannot induce distributive reading. On the other hand, the scrambled sentence in (28) looks like a sentence with basic word order. In this case, if the scrambled object has a heavy stress or contrastive stress it might be misunderstood as a contrastive subject as well. In other words, in (28), the scrambled object NP might be misunderstood as the subject. I will discuss more on this example at the end of this section.

- (27) agar [bishaz 3-(ta) madrese]_i 15-(ta) bank t_i ta'mir-kon-and...
 if more than 3 school 15 bank repair-do-3pl...
 "If fifteen banks repair more than three schools..."
 NOM > ACC 15 bank > bishaz 3-ta madrese
 *ACC > NOM bishaz 3-ta madrese > 15 bank

- (28)? agar [bishaz 3-(ta) madrese]_i bishaz 15 -(ta) bank t_i ta'mir-kon-and...
 if more than 3 school more than 15 bank repair-do-3pl...
 -bishaz 3-ta madrese > bishaz 15-ta bank

In the following examples (29 and 30), the specific direct object is scrambled over the subject. The reading of these sentences is the same as the non-scrambled ones; wide-scope reading and distributive interpretation are possible for both the subject and object.

- (29) agar [3-(ta) madresa-ro]_i 15 -(ta) bank t_i ta'mir-kon-and...
if 3 schools -ra 15 bank repair-do-3pl...
"If fifteen banks repair (the) three schools..."
NOM > ACC 15-ta bank > 3-ta madresa-ro
ACC > NOM 3-ta madresa-ro > 15-ta bank

- (30) agar [5-(ta) madrese-ro]_j bish-az 2 bank t_j ta'mir-kon-and...
if 5 school -ra more than 2 bank repair-do-3pl...
"If two or more banks repair (the) five schools..."
ACC > NOM 5-ta madrese-ra > bish-az 2 bank
NOM > ACC bish-az 2 bank > 5-ta madresa-ro

Let us now return to example (28). According to Karimi (2003, 2005), the scrambling of a nonspecific object is limited and this element can potentially move only when it has a heavy or contrastive stress. In example (28), as already repeated, both the subject and object are plural and inanimate NPs. Agreement between subject and verb is possible for both NPs in this example, because both the subject and object NPs have the same semantic features.

- (28)? agar [bishaz 3-(ta) madrese]_j bishaz 15 -(ta) bank t_i ta'mir-kon-and...
if more than 3 school more than 15 bank repair-do-3pl...

In this case, the nominative and accusative case marks for nonspecific direct objects are covert. Then, the scrambled nonspecific direct object might be misunderstood as the subject and the subject NP that is outwardly adjacent to the predicate could be interpreted as the object.

In the examples given below, both the subject and scrambled object are nonspecific; but in these cases, a misunderstanding does not occur because there is an agreement between the predicate and the subject, and not the scrambled object. In (31 and 32), a subject is a singular NP unlike the object and in (33), only the subject NP is plural.

- (31) agar [bish-az 3-(ta) sib]_j 1 bacche t_j bexorad
if more than 3 apple 1 child eat-3sg
"If one child eats more than three apples..."

- (32) agar [bish-az 3 madrese]i 1 bank ti tamir-kon-ad...
 if more than 3 school 1 bank repair-do-3sg
 "If one bank repairs more than three schools..."
- (33) agar [1 madrese]i bish-az 2-(ta) bank ti tamir-kon -and ...
 if 1 school more than 2 bank repair-do -3pl
 "If more than two banks repair one school..."

In (34), both the subject and scrambled object are plural, but a scrambled object is an inanimate NP and an agreement with the predicate cannot occur in this case. The predicate in this example is the verb read and only an inanimate NP can act as an internal argument for the predicate read. In (31-34), the scrambled nonspecific direct object cannot take wide scope over the subject.

- (34) agar [bish-az 3-(ta) maghale]i 5-(ta) daneshju ti bexan-and
 if more than 3 paper 5 student read-3pl
 "If five students read more than three papers..."

From the above data, we can presume that a scrambled non specific direct object, in contrast to an non specific indirect object, cannot take wide scope over the subject, and hence cannot induce distributive reading.

Further, in this section, I discuss the change in scope in ditransitive construction in Persian. A ditransitive construction in Persian has two word orders with respect to the specificity of direct object as illustrated in (35). The specific direct object followed by particle -ra is located in the position before the indirect object, and the nonspecific direct object is located after the indirect object and is adjacent to the predicate. The examples in (36a, b) show two positions for the direct object in Persian.

- (35) a. (S) (O+ra) (PP) V
 b. (S) (PP) (O) V (Karimi, 2003)

- (36) a. Farzad ketab-o be Mehrnaz dad
 Farzad book-ra to Mehrnaz gave
 "Farzad gave Mehrnaz the book."
- b. Farzad be Mehrnaz ketab dad
 Farzad to Mehrnaz book gave
 "Farzad gave Mehrnaz book."

In this part, we consider the scope of the object in ditransitive construction. We discuss the basic word order first. In (37), a specific direct object is located before the indirect object and takes a wide scope over the indirect object. In this case, the indirect object cannot take wide scope over the direct object because it is a nonspecific NP.

- (37) agar ostad Kimura 3-daneshju-ra be bish-az-10 sherkat mo'arefi-kon-ad...
if teacher Kimura 3-student-ra to more than 10 company introducing-do-3sg
"If professor Kimura introduces (the) three students to more than ten companies..."
ACC > DAT 3-daneshju-ra > bish-az- 10 sherkat
*DAT > ACC *bish-az- 10 sherkat > 3-daneshju-ra

In (38), both direct and indirect objects are specific. In this case, an indirect object also can take wide scope as compared to the direct object and induce distributive reading because of its specificity.

- (38) agar ostad Kimura 3-daneshju-ra be 10 sherkat mo'arefi-kon-ad...
if teacher Kimura 3-student -ra to 10 company introducing-do-3sg
"If professor Kimura introduces (the) three students to (the) ten companies..."
ACC > DAT 3-daneshju-ra > 10-ta- az sherkat-ha
DAT > ACC 10 sherkat > 3-daneshju-ra

In (39) and (40), the direct objects are nonspecific NPs that are adjacent to the verb. The indirect object in (39) is a specific NP occupying a higher place than the nonspecific direct object and takes wide scope over the direct object. The same condition is in (40), while the indirect object is nonspecific NP and takes wide scope over the direct one.

- (39) agar ostad Kimura be 2 sherkat bish-az 10 daneshju mo'arefi-kon-ad...
if teacher Kimura to 2 company more than 10 student introducing -do-3sg
"If professor Kimura introduces more than ten students to (the) two companies..."
DAT > ACC 2-ta -az sherkat-ha > bish-az 10 daneshju
*ACC > DAT *bish-az 10 daneshju > 2 sherkat

- (40) agar ostad Kimura be bish-az- 2 sherkat bish-az 10 daneshju mo'arefi-kon-ad ...
if teacher Kimura to more than 2 company more than 10 student introducing -do-3sg
"If professor Kimura introduces more than ten students to more than two

companies…"

DAT > ACC bish-az- 2 sherkat > bish-az 10 daneshju

*ACC > DAT *bish-az 10 daneshju > bish-az- 2 sherkat

From the above data, we can conclude that an object that occupies the higher position in the basic word order can take wide scope over another object irrespective of its specificity, and further, an object that is placed in a lower position in the basic word order can take a wide scope over another object, only if it is a specific NP.

According to Hayashishita (1999, 2000), a scrambled nonspecific NP can take wide scope over other NPs and induce distributive reading. In (41), the nonspecific indirect object is scrambled over a specific direct object, then the nonspecific indirect object can take wide scope and induce distributive reading over the direct object.

- (41) agar ostad Kimura [be bish-az-10 sherkat]_i 3-daneshju-ra t_i mo`arefi-kon-ad…
 if teacher Kimura to more than 10 company 3-student -ra introducing-do-3sg
 "If professor Kimura introduces (the) three students to more than ten companies…"
 ACC > DAT 3-daneshju-ra > bish-az- 10 sherkat
 DAT > ACC bish-az- 10 sherkat > 3-daneshju-ra

In (42), the scrambled indirect object takes wide scope over the direct object. In this case, the wide scope reading for direct object is also possible like the basic word order.

- (42) agar ostad Kimura [be 10 sherkat]_i 3-daneshju-ra t_i mo`arefi-kon-ad…
 if teacher Kimura to 10 company 3-student -ra introducing-do-3sg
 "If professor Kimura introduces three students to (the) ten companies…"
 ACC > DAT 3-daneshju-ra > 10 sherkat
 DAT > ACC 10 sherkat > 3-daneshju-ra

In (43) and (44), the scrambled direct object is nonspecific and is placed over the direct object. As a result of movement, the nonspecific direct object in this example can take wide scope over the indirect object and induce distributive reading. Then, we can presume that scrambling creates new scope for nonspecific objects.

- (43) agar ostad Kimura [bish-az 10 daneshju]_i be 2 sherkat t_i mo`arefi-kon-ad…
 if teacher Kimura more than 10 student to 2 company introducing -do-3sg

"If professor Kimura introduces more than ten students to (the) two companies..."

DAT > ACC 2 sherkat > bish-az 10 daneshju

ACC > DAT bish-az 10 daneshju > 2 sherkat

(44) agar ostad Kimura [bish-az10 daneshju], be bish-az-2 sherkat t_i mo`arefi-kon-ad
...

if teacher Kimura more than 10 student to more than 2 company introducing
-do-3sg

"If professor Kimura introduces more than ten students to more than two companies..."

DAT > ACC bish-az- 2 sherkat > bish-az 10 daneshju

ACC > DAT bish-az 10 daneshju > bish-az- 2 sherkat

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I focused on the change of scope of the subject and objects in simple and ditransitive constructions with respect to their specificity and the relationship between specificity and scrambling in the Japanese and Persian languages. I found that similar to Japanese, a scrambled indirect object in Persian can take a wide scope irrespective of its specificity. On the other hand, a scrambled nonspecific object in Persian cannot assume a wider scope as compared to that of the subject. This finding presumes that the scrambling of a nonspecific direct object is limited in Persian. I found that the change of scope also depends on the types of NPs. As observed in this paper, NPs qualified by modified numerals in the direct object position display different behavior. I show that as a result of scrambling, this kind of nonspecific direct object can show wide scope over other quantifier NPs. In Persian, a scrambled nonspecific direct object over indirect object can take wide scope over an indirect object when the latter is an NP quantified by a bare or modified numeral. This result is in opposition to Karimi's (2003) argument that a nonspecific direct object cannot take wide scope over other NPs, even when scrambled. Thus, we can conclude that in the Persian language, a change of scope with scrambling is dependent on both specificity and the type of NPs.

References

- Hayashishita, J.-R. (2000). Scope Ambiguity and 'Scrambling'. In *Proceedings of WCCFL19*
 ——— (2000). More on Two Ways of Driving Distributive Reading .To appear in *Japanese/
 Korean Linguistics* vol.9, CSLIPublication.
 ——— (1999). *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, pp. 201-216.

- University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 6.1, 1999.
- Karimi, Simin. (1999b). Specificity Effect: Evidence from Persian, *Linguistic Review* 16: 125-141.
- (2003). *Word Order and Scrambling*. Malden, Mass.; Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell
- (2005). *A Minimalist Approach to Scrambling*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Lauri Karttunen. (1976). Discourse reference. In *SYNTAX AND SEMANTIC*. Academic press
- Liu, Feng-his. (1990). *Scope Dependency in English and Chinese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles
- Mahootian, Shahrzad. (1997). *Persian*. Routledge
- Portner, P. & Yabushita, K. (2001). Specific Indefinite and the Information Structure Theory of Topics, *Journal of Semantics* 18: 271-297, Oxford University Press
- (1998). The Semantics and Pragmatics of Topics Phrases, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21: 117-157, Oxford University Press
- Tsujimura Natsuko. (1999). *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*. Blackwell

PhD student, Tohoku University Art and Letters Linguistic studies